

REMARKS

The Examiner has reopened prosecution on the merits in light of Applicants' Appeal Brief filed on November 16, 2006. Claims 1-5, 7-8 and 10-11 are pending in the Application.

The drawings are now objected to. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the features of "network-connected home environment" and "devices within the home," as recited in claim 7, are not shown in the drawings. Office Action (2/26/2007), page 3. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants kindly direct the Examiner's attention to the entire claim limitation in claim 7 embodying the above-indicated phrases: "a gateway component for controlling communications across the link, the gateway component limiting the operations which can be performed at the first data processing unit in response to requests from the second processing unit to only a predefined set of permitted operation, wherein the first and second data processing units and the link between them are implemented within a network-connected home environment, and the security-critical resources include security-critical devices within the home which are managed by application programs running on the first data processing unit."

The gateway component, as described in the above-cited claim limitation, is shown in Figure 1 as element 180. Further, the security-critical resources, as described in the above-cited claim limitation, are shown in Figure 1 as element 60. Further, the link, as described in the above-cited claim limitation, is shown in Figure 1 as element 190.

With respect to the wherein clause further defining the link between the first and second data processing units (implemented within a network-connected home environment) and further defining the security-critical resources as including security-critical devices within the home, there is no requirement to specifically show the aspects of these elements in a Figure. Drawings showing these aspects for these elements ("implemented within a network-connected home environment" and

"security-critical devices within the home") are not necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented and therefore is not required under 37 C.F.R. §1.81. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the objections to the drawings.

Claim 4 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claim 4 is now further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Further, claim 10 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Charles P. Pfleeger, "Security in Computing," 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 1996 (hereinafter "Pfleeger"). Additionally, claim 10 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Barkley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,202,066) (hereinafter "Barkley"). Claims 1 and 10-11 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nathanson (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,268). Claims 7-8 and 10 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,060,994) in view of Pfleeger. Further, claim 2 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathanson in view of Coverdill et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,080) (hereinafter "Coverdill"). Additionally, claim 4 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathanson in view of Elkin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,123,174) (hereinafter "Elkin"). Claim 3 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathanson in view of Coverdill and in further view of Serughett, "OSEK: a super-small kernel for deeply embedded applications?" 1999) (hereinafter "Serughett"). Further, claim 5 is now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathanson in view of Elkin and in further view of Serughett. Additionally, claims 7-8 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,706,191) (hereinafter "Bassett") in view of Richardson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,202) (hereinafter "Richardson").

With respect to all these rejections, Applicants respectfully reinstate the Appeal Brief filed on November 16, 2006 by filing herewith a second notice of appeal in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §41.31 and filing herewith a complete new Appeal Brief (referred to as the "Second Appeal Brief") in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §41.37. Applicants note that any fees paid for the first notice of appeal and for the first Appeal Brief previously paid will be applied to this second appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD P.C.

Attorneys for Applicants

By: 

Robert A. Voigt, Jr.

Reg. No. 47,159

P.O. Box 50784  
Dallas, TX 75201  
(512) 370-2832

Austin\_1 467137v.1